

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this response, claims 2-10 are pending in the instant application, of which claim 2 is independent. Claims 1 and 11-16 have been previously canceled. Claims 2 and 8 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application and at least at page 5, ¶ 5 of the Specification and Figures 1-2. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define over prior art.

**I. Objections to Claims**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that in claim 2 is objected because of informalities. *See* Office Action, page 3, § 2.

In response, Applicants amend claim 2 to delete the term “being” that appears in the following feature: “one bearing cap to clamp said at least one bearing cap ~~being~~ between said corresponding half-mandrel,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant believes that the amendment addresses the Examiner’s concern. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 2.

**II. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Regarding claim 8, the Examiner indicates that the term “at least one force-actuated detent” is confusing because it is not clear whether the force-actuated detent is the same detent recited in the independent claim 2 or it is a different detent. *See* Office Action, page 3, § 4.

In response, Applicant amends claim 8 to recite that *the one or more detent is/are force-actuated*. Applicant believes that the amendment addresses the Examiner’s concern. Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and, as such, incorporates each and every element of claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the §112 rejection of claims 8-9.

### III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0011842 by Hahnel et al. (hereinafter “Hahnel”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant amends claim 2 to further define the recess and how the gripping means grip the recess. Specifically, amended claim 2 recites *at least one of the one or more protruding engagement members being configured to grip at a recess of one half-mandrel corresponding to said at least one bearing cap from an upper side and an under side of the extension mandrel, while the other half-mandrel is movable with respect to the gripping means, the recess having horizontal surfaces on which the engagement members of the gripping means engage.* Applicant respectfully submits that Hahnel does not disclose this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Hahnel does not disclose a view looking through the bearing caps so it is hard to tell what the structure of the gripping means actually comprises. *See* Office Action, page 6, § 8. Applicant respectfully submits that Hahnel fails to disclose how the gripping means 14a, 14b would be in contact with the extension mandrel. Specifically, Hahnel fails to disclose *at least one of the one or more protruding engagement members being configured to grip at a recess of one half-mandrel corresponding to said at least one bearing cap from an upper side and an under side of the extension mandrel, while the other half-mandrel is movable with respect to the gripping means, the recess having horizontal surfaces on which the engagement members of the gripping means engage,* as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 2.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Hahnel does not include each and every feature of claim 2. Claims 3-8 and 10 depend from claim 2 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 2. Therefore, claims 3-8 and 10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

**IV. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahnel in view of any of U.S. Patent No. 6,457,621 by Hahnel et al. (hereinafter Hahnel II”), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023939 by Hase (hereinafter “Hase”) or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104864 by Knoll et al. (hereinafter “Knoll). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 9 depends from claim 2 and, as such, incorporates all of the features of claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that any combination of Hahnel, Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 9. For example, the combination of Hahnel, Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll does not teach or suggest *at least one of the one or more protruding engagement members being configured to grip at a recess of one half-mandrel corresponding to said at least one bearing cap from an upper side and an under side of the extension mandrel, while the other half-mandrel is movable with respect to the gripping means, the recess having horizontal surfaces on which the engagement members of the gripping means engage*, as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 2.

In light of the arguments presented above, Hahnel does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 2. Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll are cited to provide teachings for the feature added in claim 9. However, Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll fail at curing the shortcomings of Hahnel with respect to these features because Hahnel II, Hase and Knoll all refer to devices for breaking piston rods as opposed to bearing cases, as recited in the claimed invention. The cited references, taken either alone or in any reasonable combination, fails to teach or suggest at least the foregoing feature of Applicant’s claim 2.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (617) 202-4636.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. HEU-003USRCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: December 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Neslihan I. Doran/  
Neslihan I. Doran  
Registration No.: 64,883  
Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 202-4636  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant